CONCA 25 18

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

SPEECH

DELIVERED BY

HON. CHARLES MURPHY

ON THE

MOTION FOR A FURTHER INVESTIGATION INTO THE PRINTING BUREAU

OTTAWA, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1911.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Secretary of State). Mr. Speaker, although spring has arrived for the rest of the world the winter of his discontent seems still to hang heavy upon the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). If I may be permitted to coin a phrase that would describe that hon. gentleman's recent political condition I would say that it has been one of progressive disappointment. A few weeks ago the reports in certain newspapers credited the hon. gentleman with being sorely disappointed at that time on account of the fact that a certain agitation which was then said to be on foot had not focused in his immediate vicinity and did not result in an exchange of positions between himself and the hon. the leader of the opposition. A short time later the hon. gentleman's reputation as a parliamentary wit was rudely shattered by a little 7 x 9 story which was told at his expense by the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), and now, Sir, it falls to my lot to further increase his disappointment by declining to accept the motion which he has just presented to the House.

In passing, I might say that the ordinary courtesy extended to a minister whose department is to be placed under review was not, it appears to me, extended on this occasion, because I was not furnished with a copy of the hon. gentleman's motion until late this morning. However, I am willing to treat that as an oversight and I found no complaint upon it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then why mention it? Did I understand the minister to say that he was not informed?

Mr. MURPHY. I say that I did not get a copy of the hon. gentleman's motion until late this morning.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was not drawn until this morning.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it the rule is that such a motion is generally sent on the morning of the day it is to be moved.

Mr. MURPHY. I merely mentioned the incident because I have seen on other occasions that the motion was forwarded earlier.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I notified the chief whip of the opposition several days ago and told him such a question was to be brought up and that is the usual custom.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not raising any objection to the notice; I merely mentioned that the copy of the motion was not sent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The practice is to give notice that a motion is intended to be made and to send a copy of the motion some time in the forenoon of the day on which the motion is moved. I

D2K
2116218
0831999

COP.CA.28.168

never heard any complaint about that practice before.

Mr. MURPHY. The motion, as it reached me, is somewhat wider in its terms than the notice given by the hon. member to a gentleman on this side of the House who transmitted it to me. But, be that as it may, let us look at the motion of the hon. gentleman and consider it for a few moments. In the first paragraph the hon. gentleman proposes 'that a Royal Commission be appointed to make inquiry into the management of the Printing Bureau for such time past as the commissioners may consider in the public interest.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the inquiry which has been conducted into the management of the Printing Bureau covers about twenty-five years, and the motion made by my hon. friend, as well as his speech in support of it, totally ignore both the period of time covered by that investigation and the report made as a result of it, so far as the findings of that report are directed to correct the abuses that were discovered during the course of the investigation. The first paragraph of this motion proceeds: 'With instructions to inquire fully into the causes of the want of system therein.' Why, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what has been done; that is precisely the work I and the experts whom I engaged to assist me put in a great many months at doing; and the result of that work is spread upon the pages of this report which has been before parliament and the country since last November. Then, this paragraph further proceeds: 'And to report who is to blame therefore, and what safeguards are to be provided to protect the country for the future.' Mr. Speaker, all of that has been done in the most minute detail. A great deal of that detail is set forth in the report which was presented to parliament in November last; and for his own purposes my hon. friend chooses to ignore that report and the work which it indicates was done before the report was in shape to present to parliament. In fact, the motion of the hon. gentleman, and the speech which he has made in support of it, go to the extent of treating the report and the investigation as two things that never happened. Now, it is taxing the credulity of this House and carrying absurdity to its extremest length to ask the House to accept any such proposition as that which the hon. gentleman lays before it in this motion.

The second paragraph of the motion begins in these terms: 'And that said commissioners be further instructed to investigate how far other departments have violated the law by usurping the powers of the Printing Bureau in the matter of printing.' Now, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the powers of the Printing Bureau were not usurped by other departments; but when printing was done through other departments, the reason for that printing having been done under the direction of another department rather than under that of the Printing Bureau was elicited in the course of the investigation, and appropriate remedies were applied to prevent that being done in the future. So that, as in the case of the first paragraph, this clause in the second is absolutely unnecessary, because it deals with matters which have been thoroughly investigated. This paragraph proceeds further: 'Or by sending in requisitions for supplies in contravention of the statute and regulations in that behalf.' Here again, a full investigation has been made, and where any irregularity has been found to exist with regard to these requisitions, that irregularity has been promptly stopped. Now, Sir, let me point out to you and to the House that this second paragraph of the hon. gentleman's motion covers the most ordinary matters of every-day departmental routine. To adopt this paragraph, I submit, would be to establish a precedent whereby parliament would be substituted for all the departments. Governmental responsibility would cease——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). And time it did.

Mr. MURPHY. My hon. friend from Leeds says it is time it did. I would just say that the country has a different opinion, and that is the reason my hon. friend is on that side of the House and we are on this side. I was proceeding to say that governmental responsibility would cease and legislation would be rendered impossible by the mass of detail which is now looked after by the several departments, and which would inevitably be transferred to parliament if the principle laid down in this second paragraph of the hon. gentleman's motion were once adopted. Briefly—and I desire in this respect to follow the example set by the hon. gentleman, as far as it is possible for me to do so—let me say that in my judgment this motion should be rejected for the very simple reason that the affairs of the Printing Bureau have been investigated, not once, but twice—first, by the responsible minister who is charged with that duty, and, secondly, by our hon. friends opposite in the Public Accounts Committee. It is true, that the investigation conducted by our hon. friends in the Public Accounts Committee was abandoned. Of late hon. gentlemen opposite have manifested a strange desire to abandon in the committee investigations for which they have pressed in this House; but in this particular instance the fact that they did choose to abandon the investiga-

09513556

tion in the Public Accounts Committee is not my fault, and certainly is not the fault of the government. Whatever blame or disadvantage may attach to hon. gentlemen opposite for having adopted that course, is a matter which concerns them and with which I am not called upon to deal. Now, Mr. Speaker, all the facts relating to the management and the conduct of the business affairs of the Printing Bureau were given to parliament and the country in November last. I assert now, from my place in this House, that so far as the Printing Bureau is concerned, there is nothing left to investigate, and I further express my belief that that is the opinion of the country as a whole. To admit that there is at the present time any ground for the motion made by the hon. gentleman would be to admit his contention that the investigation conducted at intervals during the last two years and a half was partial and incomplete. Mr. Speaker, I do not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Did not the hon. gentleman himself promise to refer this report of his to a committee?

Mr. MURPHY. No. What I did promise, and what I still intend to do, was to refer those portions of the report which relate to certain phases of the printing of parliament to a special committee, and to ask that committee to deal with the recommendations in the report, which suggest means for improving the facilities for parliamentary printing and for the smoother running of business generally between parliament and the Bureau. I was observing that the investigation which was held was a complete and a searching inve[illegible] I think I may say without egotis[illegible]ore thorough or searching inve[illegible]s ever held into any departme[illegible]overnment. During my first s[illegible]s House I heard the hon. mem[illegible]North Toronto (Mr. Foster) describe, in the course of a debate in which he took part, how closely he had applied himself to the business of the Department of Marine and Fisheries when he was first appointed to take charge of it. I listened to the hon. gentleman with a good deal of attention on that occasion, because it happened that just at that particular time I was very busily engaged with the Printing Bureau. Again I hope I am not open to the charge of egotism if I say that I have never worked harder in my life than I have worked during the last two years in endeavouring to bring about reforms in this department, and to make it all that it should be, all that its importance calls for, because the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, or, as it is commonly called, the Printing Bureau, occupies a very unique and important relation towards the other departments of the government and towards parliament itself. Parliament and all the departments have to do with the Printing Bureau. If the Printing Bureau is not run properly, if its work is not turned out as it should be, if the purchases are not made and goods supplied to the several departments as they ought to be, then not the Printing Bureau alone, but every other department of the government suffers. For that reason it struck me that I could not do any more useful service than devote my time and energy towards bringing about reform in that establishment. That I attempted to do and that I maintain I have done, and I assert, without fear of successful contradiction, that the Printing Bureau is as well managed as any department of government in this country, Dominion or provincial.

When an hon. gentleman proposes at this stage that a third investigation should be undertaken, and when he chooses to ignore all that has been done, he reminds me of the Irishman who rushed breathlessly into a railway station too late to catch his train. A bystander said to him: You did not run fast engouh. Oh, yes, he said, I ran fast enough, but I did not start soon enough. That is the trouble with the hon. gentleman. He started about two and a half years too late. As I have pointed out, the investigation I conducted was begun in November, 1908. If the hon. gentleman had before that date moved the resolution which he has presented to-day, or some other such resolution, there would be some justification for his action, but there is absolutely none now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say that I did move a resolution including these several departments, and the right hon. the Prime Minister refused it, and his followers voted it down.

Mr. MURPHY. I am referring particularly to my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup). No doubt my hon. friend the leader of the opposition moved the resolution to which he refers, but he must have moved it previous to the time I had the honour of taking my seat in this House, because no such resolution has been moved since I have been a member.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend is mistaken The resolution I refer to was moved before he came into the House in 1908, but a similar resolution was also moved by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) after the Secretary of State had occupied his seat in this House. It was not confined to any one department.

Mr. MURPHY. I must take issue with my hon. friend when he says that a resolution calling for an investigation into the

Printing Bureau was moved by the hon. member for St. Anne since I have had a seat in this House. The hon. member for St. Anne did move a resolution calling for a general inquiry into the affairs of the departments generally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The spending departments.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, the spending departments, but the terms of that resolution did not particularly apply to the Printing Bureau. In fact, a reference to 'Hansard' shows that the members who supported that resolution had in their minds the spending departments, as the leader of the opposition has just said. But the fact still remains that when my hon. friend from St. Anne's division moved that resolution on the 1st April, 1909, I had already begun an investigation into the Printing Bureau. I had begun it on November 27, 1908, four months prior to the introduction of the resolution in question. It would therefore, have been absurd for me to have handed over the Printing Bureau to any committee, or commission that might then be appointed after an investigation into the Bureau had already been begun, and was considerably advanced by the minister in charge, who was responsible to parliament, and the country.

Mr. PORTER. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that he began that investigation in October, 1908?

Mr. MURPHY. In November, 1908.

Mr. PORTER. And continued it until Gouldthrite ran away. How is it in those two years Gouldthrite's defalcations were not discovered?

Mr. MURPHY. I began the inquiry in 1908, and continued it at such intervals as my other duties would permit me to carry it on. That inquiry extended over two years, and why Gouldthrite's dishonesty was not sooner discovered is also set out in the report. I could amplify and go into details, but I do not think it is necessary on the present occasion.

Mr. NORTHRUP. How is it that when the work was begun in 1908, the hon. minister has suppressed in his report every word of the inquiry between 1908 and 1910?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know what political company the hon. member for Hastings has been in the habit of keeping, but I have only to say to him that I have suppressed nothing which ought to appear in this report. The hon. gentleman has never been charged with such a duty as that which, I may say unluckily, fell to my lot in connection with this department. If by any unlikely accident of political fortune, such a duty should be cast on him, he would realize that, in the multitude of details with which a minister is called on to deal, in the hurry of business transacted from day to day, it would be impossible for him to collect and note down everything he does, or to summarize every inquiry he has to make and keep a record of the thousand and one things that go to make up the daily routine of his duties. For that reason thousands of things done in connection with this inquiry do not appear in the report. No record was made of them, and it was impossible that any record could be made. But let me turn to the subject I was pursuing when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition interrupted me a few moments ago. I was referring to the motion introduced by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) on April 1, 1909, and debated in this House on that day, and the day following. I refer to that again for the reason that the duty of the government and of its individual members in regard to just such matters as we are now discussing was very clearly set out by the right hon. the Prime Minister in the course of that debate. Let me quote his words. They will be found in 'Hansard' of 1909, pages 3861 and 3862:

It is our duty to administer the affairs of Canada, it is our duty to manage the departments of the government. Our intention is to discharge that duty efficiently. If we do discharge that duty efficiently, well and good; if we do not, we are open to censure.

Further on the right hon. gentleman added:

I deny that it is the right of the parliament of Canada to look into the administration, that is a thing which is the duty of those charged with the administration, and for the proper discharge of that duty they are responsible to the people.

The position taken by my right hon. leader on that occasion is sustained by all constitutional writers, and more particularly by Todd in his work on parliamentary government in England. In volume 1, page 418 of that work Todd says:

In fact the ministry of the day are responsible for everything that is done in any department of the state. While it is true that the House of Commons ought to have control and supervision of every such department, its functions are those of control and not of administration.

The House can interfere with great advantage in prescribing the principle on which the executive government should be carried on. But beyond that it is impossible for the legislature to interfere with advantage in the details of the administration of the country.

And the same author, in the same volume, at page 419, says:

The intrusion of parliamentary committees into matters which pertain to the jurisdiction of the executive government is equally to be deprecated as it tends inevitably to overthrow all genuine responsibility.

Now, the principle laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister, sustained by the author whom I have just quoted and approved by this House, has been applied by me to the Printing Bureau. And still, it seems, our friends opposite are not satisfied. However, that is not to be wondered at. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be found to be consistent chiefly in their inconsistency. Speaking in the debate in 1909, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, said:

It would be unreasonable to find fault with the minister or the government if the minister, on ascertaining the wrong-doing, or at the time when he should have ascertained it with ordinary vigilance, had dismissed the wrong-doer and punished him as the law provides.

And yet, in the present instance, for having done the very thing that the hon. member for West Elgin indicated, the government is now brought to book by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who I have no doubt will expect his political friends and associates to support him in presenting this motion. I do not know whether it is too much to expect, but, having regard to consistency I might be pardoned for saying that the hon. member for West Elgin at least should oppose the motion of the hon. member for East Hastings, and vote with this side of the House because, in the present case, I have followed precisely the line he laid down in 1909 when discussing the affairs of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Let me run over some of the citations made by the hon. member for East Hastings in support of this motion, and deal briefly with certain arguments that he advanced in presenting them to the House. Let me premise by pointing out that everything the hon. gentleman has mentioned in support of his motion has been taken from the report which is before parliament or from the evidence adduced before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Quite incorrect.

Mr. MURPHY. The hon. gentleman has announced nothing new. I made very full notes of what he said. He did not mention a single thing with which I was not perfectly familiar by reason of the facts elicited in the inquiry into the Department of Printing and Stationery. And, so far as that department is concerned, he did not cite a single case requiring attention that had not been attended to as a result of the inquiry I conducted, beginning nearly two years and a half ago, into the affairs of that department. At the outset, the hon. gentleman propounded a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. He cited a number of deeds of commission and omission on the part of officials in the Printing Bureau, and asked the Prime Minister whether, if he could prove these things, the Prime Minister would grant an inquiry. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman merely made a summary of what I had brought out in that investigation. Every word uttered was taken bodily from the report which has been before parliament since November last. I challenge him or any other hon. gentleman on that side to dispute my statement.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Murphy) ever heard of the Auditor General's Report? I quoted very fully from that.

Mr. MURPHY. I will come to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. gentleman should not make the statement he is making.

Mr. MURPHY. In making that statement, I am supported by the facts. I am confining myself to the list of deeds of commission and omission which was cited by the hon. member at the beginning of his speech, when he propounded a question to the Prime Minister, and asked him to say whether, if these things were proven, he, the Prime Minister, would grant an inquiry. That is what I am dealing with, and I repeat, in regard to that, that every word uttered by the hon. member was found in the report which has been before parliament since November last. Therefore, how ridiculous it is on the part of the hon. member to cite matters which are now ancient history, to rise in this House and propound such a question to the Prime Minister as if what he proposed to cite was the result of labours of his own and to ask whether, in the event of his being able to prove these things an inquiry would be granted. Why, all these things were proven in the course of my investigation. That is the only way the hon. gentleman knew about them. Never by any industry or assiduity of his own could he have found them out. He comes here and poses before you and the House, and gravely asks if an inquiry will be granted on these things being proven. Why, Sir, not only have these things been discovered, but the people guilty of them have been punished, and the wrong practices that prevailed in connection with them have been stopped. There is absolutely no support for the position taken by the hon. member this afternoon except that indicated by the newspapers that support him namely,

the disappointment which they have shown ever since the facts were made public, because of what might have happened to help their political fortunes if they had been alert enough to get the conduct of this inquiry.

The hon. gentleman did me the honour to quote somewhat fully from my report as it appears from page 1 to page 8 in the volume that was presented to parliament in November last. He made these quotations for the purpose, as his after remarks proved, of showing that certain other departments had arrogated to themselves the right to get their own printing done, and from that he argued that they had invaded the territory of the Printing Bureau, and he, forsooth, assumes the attitude of the friend and champion of the Printing Bureau. We appreciate his interest, but we are not in need of his championship. Let me inform the hon. gentleman that after all the months that he has put in upon this work he would have been better advised if he had paid less attention to the information that was given him by the gentleman whose name he quoted a number of times during his speech and to whom I will refer a little later on. In connection with the matter now being immediately dealt with the reason that the other departments were from time to time forced to get their printing done otherwise than through the Printing Bureau was due to the ineffective methods pursued, principally by the gentlemen on whom my hon. friend places so much reliance to make a case in the present instance against the management of the Printing Bureau. Take, for instance, the Interior Department in connection with its immigration work. Immigration literature is required in a great hurry; if it is not turned out within the time specified by that department, that literature is practically of no value. When the Interior Department found in years past that their requests in that regard were not attended to at the Printing Bureau, they were of necessity forced to notify the Bureau that they would get their own printing done and supervise its speedy issue themselves. That is not a matter for which they could be blamed. True, it is contrary to the Act, but the immigration work is so important that the printing of this literature would not wait. I point out to my hon. friend that the man who was responsible for the giving out of that work and for the delay, is the man with whom my hon. friend and some other hon. gentlemen opposite have been incubating since that man was dismissed last fall for incompetence, dishonesty and falsehood.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I was dealing with certain reasons adduced by the hon. member for East Hastings in support of the motion which he presented to the House this afternoon, and that branch of my remarks I now desire to resume. In the course of his observations the hon. gentleman cited as one of the reasons why his motion should be adopted that requisitions for supplies had in the past been sent to the Printing Bureau which had not been signed by the proper officials. It is true that to some extent that did prevail, and having regard to the number of these requisitions and the magnitude of the business done between the departments and the Printing Bureau, it would be surprising if at some time or other some irregularity of that kind did not arise. But what my hon. friend failed to inform the House was that this also was a matter which was dealt with in the report, not in one place but in several places, and I am now in a position to assure you and the House that the practice has been completely stopped. Precautions have been taken not only in the departments themselves, but also in the Printing Bureau to prevent a recurrence of that practice. It did not prevail to any great extent at any time, but it has now been completely stopped.

Another trouble mentioned by the hon. member for East Hastings was that of, as he styled it, sending in proof improperly. He referred, no doubt, to what is technically known among printers as bad copy. That subject also is dealt with in several parts of the report before parliament, and one of the most important recommendations made by the experts who assisted in the investigation at the Printing Bureau deals with that very matter. The recommendation in question is, in my opinion, such an important one, that I would ask the indulgence of the House for a moment while I read a very brief extract from the report upon it. At page 40 of the joint report of Messrs. Hyde and O'Connor, there will be found recommendation No. 3 under the heading of 'Improved Copy.' There they say:

> Bad copy, editing in the proof and the revise, and revision of French translation are not defects in the management of the Printing Bureau, but are evidences of slipshod work on the part of officers of parliament and of the departments of the government where the material to be printed originates. Nevertheless, it appears to us that a recommendation upon the subject is pertinent to our report.

Then, after considering what has been done in this regard by other countries and mentioning particularly what has been done by the Imperial Sessional Committee at

Westminster, the two experts, to whom I have just referred, proceed in their recommendations as set out on page 41 of the report:

Hence a different remedy must be applied, and in our opinion it is advisable, in the interests not only of the proper management of the Printing Bureau, but of the conduct of the printing business of parliament and of all the departments of the government, that there should be some body, bureau, committee, or commission charged with the following duties:—

1. Supervision of the material to be included in departmental reports.

2. Supervision of copy for reports and other publications.

3. Supervision of the translation of all reports and publications.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as you will observe, this matter mentioned by the hon. member in support of his motion, is one that is very particularly dealt with in this report. The remedy that is here prescribed for the evil is one which is deserving of the serious consideration of this House. Briefly, what is here proposed is that there should be established, between the Printing Bureau, on the one hand, and parliament and the departments on the other hand, a clearing house to which all copy from parliament, and the different departments should be sent. In that bureau, committee, or, for the sake of more apt illustration, clearing house, as I prefer to call it, there would be a corps of officials especially skilled in dealing with work of that class. If copy was not in proper condition to be sent to the Bureau it would be sent back to the department from which it came in order to have the necessary corrections made. Such a bureau or clearing house would also perform another very necessary function, if properly manned, and there would be no trouble in having it properly manned. If the officials now doing work of this character in the different departments and in the offices of parliament were all assembled in such a bureau they would perform another necessary work namely that of supervising translations from one official language to another. If that were done the work of these departments and parliament would, in my opinion, not only be very much simplified, but there would also be a very great saving to the country and the standard of our official publications would be materially raised.

That, Sir, is one of the matters which I shall ask the special joint committee, that I hope this parliament will later appoint, to deal with particularly. In this regard might I also point out that the experts whom I have mentioned make another recommendation dealing with this very evil and, as a remedy within the Bureau itself, they suggest the appointment of an officer who would have charge of composition—the comptroller of composition, I believe, he is called. I may say, Sir, that such an officer has been appointed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who is it?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. P. M. Draper.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was he an official of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. An official of the department and one of the most capable officials employed therein. He has been appointed comptroller of composition so that there also another recommendation of the experts has been acted upon and effect given to it. My hon. friend quoted some material sent from the Department of Militia and Defence and founded some argument upon the condition of the copy as a further reason why his motion should be adopted. If my memory serves me correctly, the copy to which he referred was copy furnished for the publication known as the King's Regulations. Regarding the printing of that volume a difference of opinion arose during the inquiry between the former Superintendent of Printing, Mr. McMahon, and the gentleman who had charge of this outside work—Mr. Cook. It appeared from the evidence that Mr. Cook had sent this work to be done at an outside office, and a great many of the difficulties encountered in connection with the printing of the volume were due to the work having been sent outside. The former Superintendent of Printing contended that it could have been done just as well in the Bureau, and cited in support of his contention the fact that the French edition of the book was being printed in the Bureau at the time that work was given out.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who sent it out?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Cook, so that if there is any fault to be found in that regard it is a matter for which Mr. Cook was responsible. The bad copy that afterwards was mentioned, the changes that were made in connection with the work and the resulting increase in the cost were explained by the Department of Militia and Defence and it was simply one of those occurrences that are bound to happen in connection with a publication of that character.

Now, my hon. friend made a reference to the letting of a contract for a publication called Farm Weeds by Mr. Cook, and said that after the contract had been made another official went around the different offices in the United States and Canada, and got prices to lay before the minister. Inadvertently my hon. friend quoted the wrong publication. It was not Farm Weeds, but another publication called Farm Grasses. In connection with that transaction it might be well for me to give the House somewhat full details, so that hon.

members may appreciate exactly what kind of a gentleman Mr. Cook is, and what trouble such a gentleman can make for the officials at the head of a department. It will also be of some interest to the House to get these details in view of the fact that the hon. member for East Hastings, and possibly one or two of his associates, have pinned their political faith to Mr. Cook now that the bottom has dropped out of the anti-reciprocity league.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who are the associates?

Mr. MURPHY. I presume the course of this debate will reveal who they are. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a publication called Farm Weeds issued by the Department of Agriculture and supposed to be printed at the Printing Bureau; at least, the work was sent to the Bureau to be excuted. The arrangement in connection with that publication was that the lithographing was to be done by the Toronto Lithographing Company, and the printing and binding by the Printing Bureau. When the book was issued an early copy was sent to my office, and in looking through it I noticed that the imprint of the King's Printer, which is supposed to appear on the first page of all official publications, was absent. I made inquiry about that and was told that it was an oversight and that care would be taken to see that it did not occur again. So that at the time the book was issued I was again given the impression that the work had been done partly by the Toronto Lithographing Company, in so far as the lithographing was concerned, and partly by the Printing Bureau, in so far as the printing and binding were concerned. Later on, in answer to a question by some hon. member opposite, I heard my colleague the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) state that the Mortimer Company, I think it was, had been paid a certain amount for doing some work in connection with this publication.

That started me making further inquiries and eventually I found that the book had not been printed or bound in the Printing Bureau at all as had been originally arranged, but that the printing and binding had been done by the Mortimer Company. There was a still further inquiry and I discovered that this change in the arrangement had been made by Mr. Cook without my knowledge and approval, and, as I believe, without the knowledge or approval of the King's Printer at the time the book was presented to me. Having had that experience with Mr. Cook, when this new publication called 'Farm Grasses' was proposed, I was naturally somewhat careful to see that at the beginning the work was started properly. I insisted that tenders be asked for, notwithstanding the assurances that were given me over and over again that there was only one firm in this country that could do that work. Without my knowledge or approval Mr. Cook went to Toronto, and, on February 28th, 1910, he gave the contract for that work to the Toronto Lithographing Company. On the 26th March, 1910, I made inquiry as to the obtaining of competitive prices for which I had asked, and to that inquiry I received no reply. Two weeks later I inquired again, and then Mr. Cook, accompanied by the King's Printer came to my office. Cook had some figures which he said had been supplied by the Toronto Lithographing Company and which I declined to consider as there were no other prices. produced. He said something on that occasion about paper having been ordered and as that excited my suspicion. I made inquiry later on and heard at the Bureau that Mr. Cook had been in Toronto and that some arrangement had been made with the Toronto Lithographing Company, but just exactly what, no person seemed to know. To protect the department and myself, I then wrote to the Toronto Lithographing Company stating I had heard in an indefinite way that an official had gone to their place of business and had made some arrangement with them regarding the paper, and that as he had done so without any authority the department and its head would not recognize any transaction that might have been entered into by him. Some weeks later Mr. Cook again made his appearance in my office and produced a typewritten sheet on which he had placed a list of alleged tenders that he had received for this work. I demanded that I would be shown the invitations to tender and the replies. He did not have either invitations or replies. I then inquired how he got these prices, and he said he had gone around and got them verbally. Not to make the narrative too long, the fact is that Mr. Cook had given that contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company on the 28th of February, 1910, that he had paid these visits to my office and had misled me in the way I have described, knowing perfectly well that the Toronto Lithographing Company had been engaged on that work all during the month of March and part of the month of April. I have here the official file with the letters that passed back and forth from the Toronto Lithographing Company to the Printing Bureau; those from the Printing Bureau being either signed or dictated for signature by Mr. Cook, and notwithstanding that fact up to the end of April he continued to act towards me as if nothing at all had been done in connection with that contract, and as if he had bona fide got these tenders a summary of which he produced in my office. As I was still in doubt as to

the strange proceeding that was being carried on, I made further inquiry, and later on I found that a number of the firms whose names appeared on Cook's list had not only not submitted tenders but had not been asked to tender. Finally to get a record of the transaction I wrote to all the firms asking them to let me know just what had transpired between them and Mr. Cook. One of the firms to which I wrote, and the name of which appeared on the summary of tenders, was the Mortimer Company, of Ottawa. When the firm received my letter, Mr. William Mortimer went to the Printing Bureau and there saw Mr. Cook and produced my letter of inquiry. Mr. Cook told him that was all right, and said he would go into the King's Printer with him, but later he said that Mr. Mortimer should not come in but should wait for his return. Mr. Cook went into the office of the King's Printer alone, and later returned with two letters which he had presented to the King's Printer for signature. Although both of these letters were written in the middle of June, both were dated back to the 22nd of April, the day on which Cook had obtained the alleged tender from the Mortimer Company. These letters he handed Mr. Mortimer, the one asking the firm to submit a tender for the lithographing work in connection with 'Farm Grasses,' and the other asking them to submit a price per pound at which they would be prepared to supply the paper. Now, the circumstances under which the firm did hand in the alleged tender are set out in the letter which was read this afternoon by the hon. member for Hastings, and at this stage I need not further refer to it. Then Cook carried out a similar performance with the Toronto Lithographing Company. Mr. Speaker, what will you and this House think of a man, who, having given a contract to the Toronto Lithographing Company on the 28th of February, 1910, wrote that company on the 11th of June, 1910, dating the letter back to the 28th of February, and going through the solemn farce of asking the company which he knew had been doing the work through the month of March and part of the month of April to submit a tender for the lithographing and for the paper. With the letter that he sent that company on the 11th of June, he, without the knowledge of the King's Printer, sent the following letter as well:

Ottawa, June 11, 1910.

Gentlemen,—The enclosed letter is purely formal, being simply to place on file the facts concerning my submission of the 'Farm Grass' drawing and the specifications for printing and paper for same. The matter is now being taken up by our minister, and I hope in the course of a few days to be able to inform you as to whether you are the successful tenderer or not.

Yours truly,

R. E. COOK,
For Supt. Printing.

Imagine a man writing such a letter as that on the 11th of June, 1910, when he had given the firm a contract for the work on the 28th of February, 1910; when he had received letter after letter throughout the month of March from that firm showing the progress that they had made on the work; when he had gone to that firm and taken the copy away from them, and made an arrangement with them to return it so that they might proceed with the work.

I leave you, Sir, and this House, to characterize conduct of that kind as it ought to be characterized. But it will probably be illuminating if I direct the attention of the House to one or two other letters written by the same gentleman to other firms with whom he had the same kind of dealings. One of the firms from whom he got a price was the firm of Stahl & Jaeger, of New York. It appears that when he visited them, they gave him certain specimens of their work, and on the 24th of May they wrote to him this letter:

Dear Sir,—We gave you our estimate April 20 for furnishing your coloured plate, will you kindly advise us if the contract has been given out. We gave you a sheet of Vases, specimen of our printing, will you kindly return same to us and oblige,

Yours very truly,

STAHL & JAEGER.

To that letter Mr. Cook sent this reply:

Ottawa, May 25, 1910.

Gentlemen,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday re coloured plates, for which I have your estimate.

In reply, I have to say that owing to the death of King Edward, which has caused a lot of extra work, and the absence from the city of our minister, the Secretary of State, the contract has not yet been awarded. As soon as the successful tenderer is known you will be advised of the fact. Regarding your specimens, I will have to ask you to let them remain with me until the matter of the contract is settled, when they will be returned to you.

Yours very truly,

R. E. COOK,
For Supt. of Printing.

On the 11th of June, 1910, he also wrote Stahl & Jaeger one of the stock letters which he sent to the other firms from whom he had received the prices which he set out in the summary, produced to me as a set of tenders which he had received for this work. All the prices were received in practically the same way, and they were all of the character of that described in the

letter from the Mortimer Company which the hon. member for Hastings read this afternoon. Now, Sir, when the hon. member read that letter, he asked, in a burst of simulated indignation, 'Is it possible to think that a firm would sign such a letter?' Certainly it is. There was nothing strange about that firm signing a letter of that kind. When the members of the firm and I got together and compared notes, and each found how the other had been deceived, there was nothing remarkable about it at all. It had been represented to the firm by Mr. Cook, in his great solicitude to protect the minister—and here I should tell the House that the statement made to the different firms was that the minister was having trouble with his colleagues about this contract—and some of my colleagues who are listening to me now are hearing about it for the first time—that as the contract was over $5,000, the minister might be asked a question about it, and he wanted to fix up the file. And this gentleman, in order to assist his minister if you please, to carry out a dishonest transaction, extracted these prices from these different firms, and got the alleged tender from the Mortimer Company. What more natural than that the Mortimer Company, when they found out all the facts in their interview with me, were willing to write that letter, and gave it to me to place on file as I did in connection with the evidence given by Mr. Wm. Mortimer, and as it appears in the volume presented to the House in November last.

The hon. member for Hastings, in the course of his further observations, read my letter of the 27th of November, 1908, as it appears in this published report, and then drew attention to the fact that what he called the evidence as reported here was first taken in June, 1910, and from these two circumstances he deduced this argument, that either the minister failed to do anything between November, 1908, and June, 1910, or if he had done anything, then he had suppressed what had been done. Well, Mr. Speaker, that deduction was just as unfounded as all the rest of my hon. friend's speech. It suited my hon. friend's purpose to deal with this report as though it were something that was available to his hands for the purpose in which he was engaged to-day, but that it was not to serve any other purpose whatever. He would treat it as existent or non-existent just as it suited his purpose. Well, Sir, I object to that use of this report; I put too much time upon it, I spent too many days and nights in its preparation, to allow it to be used in any such way; and while it may suit the purpose of my hon. friend to use a part of the report and ignore the great bulk of it, I do not intend to let him escape with tactics of that kind. If he had taken the trouble to read this report, he would have found that on page 6 I had said this:

> The measures adopted at different times within the last two years to effect reforms in the organization and methods of the Printing Bureau, to improve its relations with the other departments, and to secure the earlier publication of the annual reports for parliament, are indicated in the correspondence forming appendix 1 to this report.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the hon. minister just there, if the part he is reading has any reference to any wrong-doing in the way of commissions, and so on, previous to his taking charge of the department; in other words, was there any evidence of wrong-doing during the time the Hon. Mr. Scott was minister of the department and Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I can only say that the practices of which the late Superintendent of Stationery was without doubt guilty, had extended back for a period of at least a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). By that do I understand that the wrong-doing extended back only a year or a year and a half prior to the hon. minister taking charge of the department, and that it did not really take place during the time that Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department?

Mr. MURPHY. I regret that I cannot give my hon. friend definite information so far as dates are concerned. The only way in which we could arrive at a knowledge as to when these practices started was to trace back the beginnings of the dealings with those firms in New York which undoubtedly had dishonest relations with the late Superintendent of Stationery, and those dealings began about a year or a year and a half prior to my entering the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know if the minister, in the investigation he made, had any facts to prove that during the time Mr. Dawson was in charge of the department there was any commission paid or any crookedness of any kind.

Mr. MURPHY. Dr. Dawson was undoubtedly in charge during the year or the year and a half that those dishonest relations existed between the late Superintendent of Stationery and certain New York firms.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There was nothing prior to the one-and-a-half year.

Mr. MURPHY. I am not prepared to say that there was not prior to the year and a half.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did the minister not go back as far as necessary to find out?

Mr. MURPHY. I went back for 25 years and further, and the only date I am in a position to give my hon. friend and the House with regard to the dishonest dealings that undoubtedly took place, is the date I have mentioned—about a year and a half prior to my entering the department. Just when my hon. friend last interrupted I was drawing attention to the fact that in my report and the appendix attached to it, covering some ten and one-third pages, are to be found in a general way the indications of what was going on from time to time in connection with this investigation. I have under my hand the reports from the late Superintendent of Stationery, furnished me at different times within the same period, in reply to inquiries I made as to his dealings with these firms. These would also indicate what was going on, so that it was a very unfounded assumption on the part of the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) when he said that either nothing was done between these dates, or that if anything was done, it had been suppressed.

Then he made a much more remarkable statement. He said that my investigation had revealed that there was a shortage, but that there was nothing to show that a single head had fallen on account of it. Now, I take it that an hon. gentleman occupying a seat in this House does not make a statement of that kind unless he is prepared to substantiate it; and if he does make it without being able to substantiate it, then I submit he has done something which no hon. gentleman ought to do. That is precisely the position in which the hon. gentleman put himself this afternoon. What are the facts? There were shortages and heads did fall. It might be alleged that it would be impossible for members of this House to know what has been done in the way of disciplining the staff down there if there was no information outside of what might have been furnished within the Printing Bureau itself. In such a case, an hon. gentleman might very easily be mistaken, and I would understand his making a statement in good faith such as was made by the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon. But unfortunately my hon. friend has no such excuse, because the facts appear in a document which is a document of record in this House. No later than the 12th of this month, a return was brought down in response to an order secured by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), showing the number of dismissals made from the Printing Bureau. That document was available to the hon. member for Hastings just as it is to any other hon. member. Yet in face of the fact that this document, on record in this parliament, reveals, not that one, but that a dozen or more heads fell, the hon. gentleman has the hardihood to get up and make the statement that not one head fell as a stricture on my conduct in connection with this investigation. What does this return show? It shows, first of all, that the late Superintendent of Printing had to retire.

An hon. MEMBER. What was his name?

Mr. MURPHY. I may tell my hon. friend from Grenville that his name was Mr. McMahon.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not ask his name.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He was superannuated; his head did not fall.

Mr. MURPHY. He had to retire. He resigned and was superannuated.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If that gentleman did wrong, why did the minister superannuate him?

Mr. MURPHY. In reply, I would say that if my hon. friend means that he did wrong in the sense of being dishonest, I say no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then he should not have been superannuated.

Mr. MURPHY. He was superannuated because it was proved that he was not competent for the office, and it was in the interest of the public service that he should be superannuated. But there were the following dismissals: Edward Auger, J. G. A. Harwood———

Mr. REID (Grenville). What were their positions?

Mr. MURPHY. That does not appear in the return. It was not called for. Only the name and date of dismissal was asked. J. G. A. Harwood, falsifying entries; John E. Bailey, loss of time, usury; Arthur Simard, intemperance; Charles Lacroix, intemperance; Alex. Baker, jr., intemperance; John Gooden, incompetence, untruthfulness, neglect of duty and responsibility for shortage of goods in his charge. The very matter mentioned by the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have you the dates of their appointments?

Mr. MURPHY. No, the order did not call for that. The other names are: Thomas Murphy, intemperance; Walter Kane, intemperance; R. E. Cook, disobeying instructions, waste of public moneys, placing of orders outside of Bureau without securing competitive prices, and for untruthful-

ness and incompetence; Greg. Burns, intemperance; Aristide Parent, intemperance.

There is the list of these dismissals, furnished this House in response to an order of this House, and yet the hon. member for Hastings this afternoon asserted that while all these things had been found out not a head had fallen. I leave you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, to characterize the conduct of an hon. gentleman who would make a statement of that kind in the face of evidence to the contrary, which was available if he chose to seek it.

The hon. gentleman further commented on certain purchases at excessive prices of toilet paper, bought in the United States. That also was exposed during the investigation, but my hon. friend thought proper to make this facetious observation with regard to it, that this paper had been sent to the penitentiaries because no one there was likely to be brought in contact with members of the opposition. Well, my hon. friend's humour is of a character that sometimes it is difficult to appreciate; and I must confess that while I did not appreciate it this afternoon, I thought it was incumbent upon me to explain to the House that the sending of this paper to places remote from Ottawa was part of the system of fraud carried on by the late Superintendent of Stationery. Had this paper been sent to any of the offices in this city or vicinity, the prices paid for it and the surrounding circumstances would have been detected very soon; but in order to prevent detection, the late superintendent of stationery was careful to see that this expensive paper was sent to the penitentiaries and some of it to the distant N. W. M. police barracks, where an investigation could not be made and where no questions were likely to be asked.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to deal with certain other matters set out in the report. He referred to the binding which was done by certain officials for themselves; and judging by the question which was asked by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I think that the hon. member for Hastings unintentionally gave him, and possibly the House as well, a wrong impression as to the extent to which this binding was carried on. Let me say that there was very little of it done. There was on the part of certain employees a good deal of loose talk and extravagant statements in that connection, but upon investigation these proved to be in the main incorrect. There was the case of one book, the binding of which cost $10. The hon. gentleman mentioned that incident, but he failed to inform the House at the same time that the man who did the binding was obliged to pay for it. He only mentioned that incident a little later on when the leader of the opposition asked the question. But the question put by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) was a very pertinent one, and the hon. member for East Hastings did not answer it. I am not surprised at that, because the things the hon. member for East Hastings does not know about the Printing Bureau would fill a very much larger volume than the one which has been presented to the House. Now, let me answer the questions asked by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). That hon. gentleman inquired: How could these men do this contract binding? There was nothing of that kind. The binding that was done was usually small books. The evidence disclosed that the material used was not obtained at the bindery and there was only a portion of the work done and that usually at the noon hour or when the men had some leisure, apart from their usual work. But in every case the employee who did anything of this kind was reproved or punished as the circumstances of the case warranted, and I have the assurance of the officials there that nothing of the kind has been done since the facts were brought to light. The hon. gentleman also dealt with another matter which is very fully exposed in the Report —the money lending. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) inquired if this money lending was done by persons outside the Bureau, and it was explained by the hon. member for East Hastings that the lending was done by employees of the Bureau themselves. And here again I may remark that if the hon. gentleman had wanted to be fair he should have mentioned that the chief usurer, Mr. Bailey, had been dismissed for his practices in that connection.

The hon. gentleman referred to a question which is such an unimportant one that I can only conceive that he brought it to the notice of the House in order that it might be used for home consumption in the county which he represents. I cannot conceive that it would serve any other purpose than to be used along the side lines and on the back concessions at election time. He referred to a notice posted in the Bureau warning the officials and employees regarding waste, and quoted the evidence given by one of the employees who was examined during the investigation, and said that another employee, who happened to be a French Canadian, was referred to the notice and said that it did not concern him because it was not in French. If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair he should have gone further and quoted the evidence given by this French Canadian employee who explained fully the incidents referred to. He stated that the

other employee who questioned him about it was a man he did not like who was making himself officious in and about the Bureau, and he answered as he did simply because he did not recognize the right of this man to question him; and added unreservedly, that, of course, the notice applied to him as to others, and he felt himself bound by it. And I may say for the benefit of the hon. member from East Hastings and of any other hon. gentleman who might be disposed to raise such a question that the French Canadian employees in the Printing Bureau will compare very favourably indeed with any other class who work in that institution.

The hon. gentleman also quoted some evidence given in the report tending to show that political pull existed in the Printing Bureau. He referred to a question and answer appearing at page 237 in which the names of three employees are given and an expression of opinion is given by the witness that these men presumed a good deal upon political pull. That was a mere expression of opinion, because as a matter of fact, there is no such thing as political pull in vogue in the Printing Bureau.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MURPHY. I make that assertion with the knowledge that, not one but several of my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House know that it is perfectly true, they having had personal experience in that regard since I assumed charge of the Printing Bureau. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to read the report of Mr. E. G. O'Connor regarding the lithographic room and Mr. Cook's connection with it, and said that if Mr. Cook was to blame some one above was responsible, and no one had been punished. There again he is incorrect. The man above Mr. Cook was responsible, and he was punished. I gave his name a few minutes ago, the late Superintendent of Printing, Mr. McMahon. But there is this to be said in this connection—that Mr. Cook, on his own admission repeated, not once but several times in the evidence, ignored the Superintendent of Printing and professed to deal with the King's Printer direct, although the Superintendent of Printing was, by Mr. Cook's own acknowledgment, his superior officer. When that sort of a relation existed in an establishment of this kind, it is not surprising that irregularities happened, and that Mr. Cook did some of the things that have been already communicated to the House and others of which I will tell the House before I take my seat. But, Sir, in this connection my hon. friend should have read further, and he should have had the fairness to tell the House that in the same report from which he quoted, that of Mr. E. G. O'Connor appearing at pages 147-8-9-50 of the report, it is stated by Mr. O'Connor that the practices therein disclosed for which Mr. Cook above all other officials in the Bureau was chiefly responsible, had been stopped, as reported at the top of page 150:

These absurd prices appear to have been paid for years without protest by Mr. Cook or any other official until I called attention to it during my inquiry, and, by your authority, had it stopped.

Then my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) dilated at considerable length upon the list of purchases to be found in the Auditor General's Report and referred to the evidence given in the Public Accounts Committee in connection with several of these purchases. It is true these purchases are extensive, but they are not Bureau purchases—that is, not in the sense that these goods are intended for the Bureau. The Bureau, as is well known, makes purchases for all the departments of government and for parliament as well. My hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) did not allege that anything wrong was shown in connection with these purchases. He rather dwelt upon the number of them and expressed the view that all these goods could not have been required. No evidence was given to that effect, so I fail to see in what regard the citation of these purchases assists in any particular the position taken by my hon. friend.

The hon. gentleman also referred to a return that has been more or less discussed, which was prepared in response to an order passed at the instance of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). In connection with that return he chose to animadvert somewhat severely upon the bona fides of the present under Secretary of State, Mr. Mulvey, and having given his version of how that return had been prepared stated that if Mr. Mulvey had been honest and intelligent he would not have prepared it in the manner described by my hon. friend. I hold no brief for Mr. Mulvey. Mr. Mulvey's character is such that it is not necessary for any hon. gentleman to hold a brief for him, but I may say that there is no man more honest and there are few men as intelligent and zealous in the service of Canada as Mr. Mulvey. That is a reputation which he did not need to come to Ottawa to make; he enjoyed it while in the service of the Ontario government, both under the Ross administration and under the present Whitney administration. Having said that much in reference to Mr. Mulvey, let me say further that this return was asked for in the Public Accounts Committee. When it was asked for, I informed the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I think one other hon. gen-

tleman who was there present, possibly the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), that the return had been brought down. Certain papers were produced and it will be within the recollection of hon. gentlemen who had these papers in hand on the morning of the meeting referred to, that I pointed out the fact that the papers produced were not the return of which we were speaking. As the return could not be found, certain drafts were produced from the department and these drafts were used in place of the original return for the purpose of examining the witnesses. In that way these drafts became exhibits in that committee. It has since transpired that what we thought were drafts were in reality the original return, and they have, in consequence, been a matter of record in the Public Accounts committee since January 20 last. What the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) complained of was that while the order of the House asked for a return showing the printing, advertising and lithographing done outside the Bureau, Mr. Mulvey in having the return made up excluded the cost of paper, that being a matter which in his judgment did not enter into the return, having regard to the terms of the order. That was discussed in the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Mulvey's view regarding it was fully and frankly stated and it is not necessary to go further into it now. But as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) inquired this afternoon whether the return on its face showed that the cost of paper had been excluded, and he was informed in reply by the hon. member for East Hastings that it did not, let me correct that statement by informing you, Sir, and the House, that while one of the two documents now on file in the Public Accounts Committee, neither of which it so happens was ever brought down to the House, although I was under that impression when we met in the Public Accounts Committee, and so stated, would show only the cost of printing lithographing and advertising; another shows specifically the cost of the paper as well. Thus all the information that was asked for may be obtained by any hon. gentleman who desires to have recourse to these two documents. My hon. friend referred also to a transaction in connection with which Mr. Cook obtained considerable prominence and I desire to give the particulars which my hon. friend did not have in his possession; possibly if he had had them he would not have referred to the question at all. He spoke of an order given to the Gananoque 'Recorder' and told the House what had been done in that regard, practically in the same terms as Mr. Cook, on a certain occasion, explained it. As this is a matter of some importance and as it illustrates even better than any other example I can give what kind of methods were pursued by Mr. Cook in connection with the office he held in the Printing Bureau, I will ask your indulgence and that of the House while I read Mr. Cook's evidence on the subject as given at pages 266 and 267 of the Report:

Q. There has also been some evidence given regarding an order for 100 000 pamphlets which you placed with the Gananoque 'Reporter' for the Interior Department, and in his evidence the King's Printer has said that when he got an explanation of the matter from you, he was told that you had stopped off in Gananoque and had inspected the plant in the office of the 'Reporter,' had satisfied yourself that they were equipped to do the work, and gave that as one reason why the order was placed; and an additional reason stated by the King's Printer, as given to him by you, was that Mr. Britton, the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter,' had been at one time a Liberal candidate. What have you to say as to the placing of that order?—A. I asked the King's Printer, as he had several of those immigration pamphlets, and as I thought that Mr. Britton had been a good friend to me, and had never had anything which I felt he was in a position to do, even when all that work was placed under my distribution by Dr. Dawson. This afforded a good opportunity to put something in his way and show him that I appreciated what he had done for me. I may say that I served part of my apprenticeship in that office. Naturally I had a warm spot in my heart for it, and I asked the King's Printer, who consented, seeing that the price was a reasonable one, and the work was executed in good time.

Q. But I understand from the King's Printer that he did not know anything about the work being placed until after you had gone there?—A. No, he understood it before I went there.

Q. That is not what he stated?—A. That is the fact all the same. I may say that it has been my unfailing practice to consult Mr. Parmelee in regard to everything that has been sent out.

Mr. Murphy.—When there is a very serious conflict of opinion as to fact between you and Mr. Parmelee, I would like to get at the bottom of the matter.

Mr. Parmelee.—My recollection of the facts is that Mr. Cook was at Gananoque, his old home, not on Bureau business at all, and that he came back here and spoke to me about the 'Reporter' office, told me how it was equipped, that Britton was publishing a paper there in the face of a good many difficulties, and that there was a little pamphlet which they might print. What followed was that if they were in a position to do the work cheaply and well, with prompt delivery, I did not object. I did not intend to say that I did not know the order was placed until long after. What I intended to say was that I did not ascertain until long after that the 'Reporter' office did not do the work.

Mr. Cook.—I had not been near the 'Reporter' office or consulted them before I men-

tioned the matter to Mr. Parmelee. I was going to Toronto in connection with other work, and I dropped off from one train to the other——

Gentlemen in the habit of travelling between Toronto and Ottawa will notice what a direct route Mr. Cook followed:

—and I dropped off one train to the other and visited the 'Reporter' office to see what they had there. I had not been near them before or broached the subject, not did I know that there was such a thing when I was on my holidays long before. I found that they had the same power press as we had, a folding machine, a trimmer, and everything that was necessary to do the work.

Q. There has been further evidence given here by Mr. Parmelee, corroborated by another witness, that on one occasion in this room, when this particular order was under discussion, you mentioned that when the proofs of the work came to the Bureau, you saw that it was not being done by the Gananoque 'Reporter,' but by the Ottawa 'Free Press,' and that you did not make any mention of the matter because you did not want to bring Mr. Norman Smith down about your ears or something to that effect?—A. That is practically right. When the first proofs came here, the manager of the 'Free Press,' Mr. Barker, told me that he had made arrangements with Mr. Britton to do the work. After thinking the thing over, I thought, well, so long as they did it, we had a hard and fast price fixed. I did not know just exactly what to do, and I let the matter go.

Q. You did not report it to Mr. Parmelee?—A. No, I did not. I thought that so long as we got the work, and got it at a reasonable price, I did not want to incur the displeasure of the 'Free Press.'

Q. You were aware that the 'Free Press' was not doing it for the price you had fixed for the Gananoque 'Reporter'?—A. No. I asked Mr. Barker afterwards what he was doing it for. He said there was not much margin in it for them, he was kicking at what they had to do it for. As a matter of fact, he told me that they were doing it for something in the neighbourhood of $200 less than the Gananoque 'Reporter' got it for.

So that as a business transaction the Bureau could have paid what the 'Free Press' charged for it?—A. I do not know. We were paying for that work the ordinary rate the Immigration Department had been paying right along, and it was a pretty close price.

I might interject here that that statement is absolutely untrue as are most of Mr. Cook's statements.

Q. But not so close that the 'Free Press' was not able to shave it off a couple of hundred dollars?—A. I asked Mr. Barker how he could account for that. He said: 'We are dead, we are dormant, and it is a filler; there is not much in it, but it is better than nothing—better than having our presses standing.' I made up my mind that if we had pamphlets of that kind in the future, it would be a bidding proposition. I know that prices vary according to the amount of work in offices at times. You will get high tenders at certain times and low tenders at others. It depends on how busy they are.

Q. After the work was completed, the Gananoque 'Reporter' rendered their account, did they not?—A. Yes.

Q. And it was presented to you in due course, and vouched for by you?—A. Yes. We had a complete delivery of the work, and we put through an account for it.

Q. And to that account you attached this certificate: 'Examined, prices fair and just. (Sgd.) R. E. Cook?'—A. Yes.

Q. When you put that on the account rendered by the Gananoque 'Reporter,' you knew, as you have just explained, that the work was done in the Ottawa 'Free Press office?—A. Yes, I must admit that I was aware of it at that time.

The effect of that evidence was to leave me under the impression that this gentleman knew nothing about the Ottawa 'Free Press' having done that work until the proofs came to him from the 'Free Press' office; yet he admitted that when he certified the account as fair and just he had knowledge that the 'Free Press' had done that work for $200 less than he had certified the Gananoque 'Reporter' account for, and he explained that by saying that he thought that was the best thing to do.

But, there is another chapter of this transaction that has come to hand since this report was printed. You will observe in the evidence given by this worthy gentleman, upon whom the hon. member for Hastings places such reliance, that he mentions an interview that occurred with Mr. Barker of the 'Free Press'. After this report was printed and circulated the attention of Mr. Barker was drawn to the evidence given by Mr. Cook. After Mr. Barker had read that evidence he came down to my office to explain that Cook's version was absolutely false from beginning to end. He further explained that Cook had first of all arranged a price of $1,160 with the Gananoque 'Reporter,' that later on Cook had arranged a second price of $950 with him, and not only arranged that, but he had arranged that the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter' was to come to Ottawa, get the copy from the Bureau and go up to the 'Free Press' office with it; later still that when the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter' came to Ottawa, Cook actually telephoned, and made arrangements for him to go up; that later still, when the Ottawa 'Free Press' inquired as to how they were to be paid, this worthy gentleman told them to render their account to the Gananoque 'Reporter,' and that he would notify them when the cheque was issued from the Bureau to the Gananoque 'Reporter.' He also directed them to send the proofs to him while the work was in progress. This was such an astounding statement, in view of the evidence given by this gentleman

who is now regarded as one of the new props of the Conservative party——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, my hon. friend may well call 'order', but he should address his remarks to his own friends. This was such an astounding statement that I asked Mr. Barker if he would put it in writing; he did so, and I have here the following letter which I shall read to the House:

Ottawa, February 3, 1911.

Hon. Chas. Murphy, M. P.,
Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—My attention has recently been called to certain statements in the published report of the Printing Bureau inquiry which I desire to correct. The statements referred to were made by Mr. R. E. Cook in his explanation of the way in which he gave an order for the printing of 100,000 pamphlets to the Gananoque 'Reporter'. The facts for which I can vouch are as follow:

About the middle of January, 1910, I went to the Printing Bureau and interviewed Mr. Cook on business. In answer to my inquiry he said it was not likely that any work would be sent outside for some time, but that an order for 100,000 pamphlets had been placed with the Gananoque 'Reporter,' and that they were not in a position to handle it as they had not the necessary plant. He added that if I, on behalf of the Ottawa 'Free Press,' would quote a low enough price on the work he would advise Mr. Britton, the proprietor of the Gananoque 'Reporter,' to give it to us, and that if our price was not satisfactory Mr. Britton would very likely send the work to Montreal. He said he would prefer to have it done in Ottawa, as in that case he could look after it and see that it was properly done. Mr. Cook then handed me a sample pamphlet from a prior edition, and asked me to get the price down low as Mr. Britton had a low figure.

After figuring the cost of the work I again went to the Bureau and told Mr. Cook our price would be $950.00. He said he thought this would be satisfactory, and that he would advise Mr. Britton when he came to Ottawa for the copy to leave the work with us. On January 25, 1910, Mr. Cook telephoned me that Mr. Britton was on his way up to our office with the copy, and that everything was satisfactory. Upon Mr. Britton's arrival at our office he stated that Mr. Cook had sent him up and I gave him a written quotation for the work which he then turned over to us at $950.00.

While the work was in progress I telephoned Mr. Cook as to where the proofs were to be sent and be told me to send them to him. This was done.

When I inquired from Mr. Cook as to the manner in which payment would be made, he told me to send our account to Mr. Britton, and that the latter would send this account to the Bureau. He further informed me that he would notify me when a cheque was forwarded from the Bureau to Mr. Britton, and advised me to draw on the latter at sight. These instructions were followed and payment was duly made.

Yours truly,
(Signed) A. H. BARKER,
Superintendent Printing,
Ottawa Free Press, Limited.

I do not wish to characterize, in language that would be either harsh or unparliamentary, the conduct of any man, but, Sir, I leave it to you, and the House to say whether or not Mr. Cook was treated harshly or too leniently when he merely lost his position in the Printing Bureau. I am still prosecuting this inquiry, and when I have all the facts elicited, delay having been caused in getting some of them owing to the departure of Mr. Barker from the city, I intend to hand the matter over to the Department of Justice.

I do not wish to weary the House. I have been obliged to go into these matters in some detail, but the balance of the speech of my hon. friend does not, it seems to me, call for any special comment at this late hour. He did in one particular address himself especially to me, and asked me to give him my opinion of the fact that $60,000 had been expended for typewriters and typewriter supplies. He asked me if I did not consider that a little too high. Certainly I did, and I do. That also is a matter dealt with in the report, and it is because of the opinion that I hold in regard to that, that the purchase of these supplies has been stopped, and that the Bureau, since the investigation, has not purchased any supplies except those that were urgently required and which they had not in stock.

Now, my hon. friend read a large list of directories, dictionaries, and other goods that had been supplied to the various departments, and he seemed to find fault with that. Again, I have only to make this observation that it is not the business of the Bureau to determine what parliament or this or that department requires for its use. The Bureau's business is to purchase goods when they receive requisitions for these goods properly vouched for, and properly signed, either from parliament or a department. As my hon. friend has chosen to treat the investigation that was held by me, and which is still going on, as something that has never happened, and as he has chosen to disregard this report of nearly 500 pages, and to treat it merely as something which can be used to bolster up his motion, and to serve no other purpose whatever, let me, Mr. Speaker, draw your attention, and the attention of the House to some of the changes that have been introduced into the Printing Bureau in consequence of that investigation, and by reason of the recommendations made by the experts who assisted at that investigation.

In the first place the proofreaders who were formerly scattered throughout the building have been assembled in one room; the stereotype room has been consolidated; the stores department has been separated from the purchasing department and taken over by a chief storekeeper who is independent of the purchasing agent; six monotypes have been ordered and installed; time-recording clocks have been ordered and installed, and these are intended to do away with the irregularities that were found to exist in connection with the attendance books. A number of small offices have been torn down, and a long room established in which the whole clerical staff has been accommodated; the stationery storeroom has been made secure so that no one can have access thereto after office hours; a woman's lunch room established; a chief electrician has been appointed; a loose leaf and office device expert has been appointed; it has been arranged that all correspondence shall pass through the King's Printer's office instead of through those of various officials as formerly; additional ruling machines have been ordered; a controller of composition has been appointed; a purchasing agent has been appointed in order to keep the stores department separate and distinct from the printing department; the main entrance, halls and corridors of the building have been cleaned and painted; an internal telephone system has been installed; modern methods of requisitioning for supplies on purchasing agent and on stores clerk from the printing division have been introduced, an officer has been appointed to watch work jackets for the purpose of expediting work and to check overlooked orders for printing; a cost system has been introduced and its installation is in progress in the several branches of the Bureau where it is expected to be completed within a month; arrangements have been made to lessen rush orders from the departments so that they may be dealt with in a businesslike way; a register of correspondence has been established; linotype cleaners have been appointed so that the half hour lost each day by the operators in cleaning their machines may in future be saved; a lithograph expert has been appointed to supervise copy sent by departments and to check lithograph and map accounts; the practice of securing advance prices in all lithographic work has been established; a new stamp embossing machine has been ordered; a mechanical superintendent has been appointed; an internal fire brigade has been organized among the employees for the protection of the building and the valuable property stored therein. The stock, regarding which so much has been heard from some hon. gentlemen and from a number of the journalistic Hessians who support them, has been reduced by over $100,000. The order in council that requisitions shall be made by the Deputy Minister or by an official appointed by order in council has been strictly enforced; a system of checking has been introduced into the stores branch which prevents stores being handed out without entry; the inward checking of goods has been improved and a receiving clerk appointed; weekly meetings of chief officials have been established, and weekly reports of these meetings sent to the Secretary of State; a catalogue of loose leaf devices and instructions for ordering the same have been prepared for use in all the departments; a new stock list is being prepared. Then, Sir, in addition to these reforms which are some only of those that have been introduced, the experts who assisted in the investigation of the Bureau have visited the establishment at least once a month since this report was presented to see that their recommendations have been put in force, and to make such further investigations as they think necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, not further to take up the time of the House, I will merely say that on account of what we have done, on account of what we are still doing, on account of what we further intend to do, I must ask the House in view of the results of my investigation, of the reforms that have been introduced and of the saving that has already been effected to the country, to reject the motion proposed by the hon. member for Hastings as it is both unnecessary and impracticable in the form in which he has presented it.